

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

Listing of Claims:

1. (Currently amended) A method for automating a document review cycle involving an author of an original document and a reviewer, the method comprising the steps of:
receiving an indication that the original document is to be sent from the author to the reviewer;

in response to the indication that the original document is to be sent to the reviewer:

displaying a first set of author reviewing tools,

associating an email note with the original document,

associating a first Review Cycle Identification Number (RCID) with the original document,

storing the first RCID in a configuration file, and

sending the email note to the reviewer;

receiving a reply email from the reviewer to the author, the reply email associated with a reviewed document;

comparing a second RCID associated with the reviewed document to the first RCID in the configuration file; and

in response to a determination that the second RCID matches the first RCID, displaying a second set of author reviewing tools;

wherein the second set of author reviewing tools includes at least one tool that is separate and distinct from the first set of author reviewing tools.

2. (Original) A computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1.

3. (Original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the step of associating the email note with the original document, comprises attaching a duplicate of the original document to the email note, prior to sending the email note to the reviewer.

4. (Original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the step of associating the email note with the original document, comprises adding a link to the email note, the link identifying the location of the original document.

5. (Original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the original document contains a first Review Cycle Identification Number (RCID).

6. (Original) The method of Claim 1, further comprising the step of adding a default data to the email note, wherein the default data includes an instruction to the reviewer to review the original document.

7. (Original) The method of Claim 3, further comprising the steps of adding an author's name and an author's email address to the duplicate document.

8. (Original) The method of Claim 3, further comprising the steps of adding an Email Identification Number (EntryID) and a Store Identification Number (StoreID) to the duplicate document, the EntryID and the StoreID operative to identify the email note.

9. (Original) The method of Claim 1, wherein the RCID is generated by encoding an author identification number and an original document identification number into a single value.

10. (Currently amended) A method for automating a review cycle involving an author of an original document and a reviewer, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a duplicate document associated with an email note;

determining whether the email note was received by the author or by the reviewer;

in response to a determination that the email note was received by the author, displaying a set of author reviewing tools; and
in response to a determination that the email note was received by the reviewer, displaying a set of reviewer reviewing tools;
wherein the set of author reviewing tools includes at least one tool that is separate and distinct from the set of reviewer reviewing tools.

11. (Original) A computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 10.

12. (Original) The method of Claim 10, wherein the duplicate document is an attachment to the email note.

13. (Original) The method of Claim 10, wherein a location of the original document is identified by a link contained in the email note.

14. (Original) The method of Claim 10, wherein the duplicate document is associated with a first Review Cycle Identification Number (RCID).

15. (Original) The method of Claim 14, wherein the step of determining whether the email note was received by the author or by the reviewer, comprises comparing the first RCID associated with the duplicate document to a second RCID contained in a configuration file.

16. (Original) The method of Claim 15, wherein a match between the first RCID and the second RCID indicates that the email note was received by the author.

17. (Original) The method of Claim 15, wherein a difference between the first RCID and the second RCID indicates that the email note was received by the reviewer.

18. (Original) The method of Claim 10, wherein the author reviewing tools includes an End Review button operative to remove the second RCID from the configuration file.

19. (Original) The method of Claim 10, wherein the reviewer reviewing tools includes a Reply with Changes button operative to transmit a set of changes to the author by generating a reply email note.

20. (Original) The method of Claim 19, further comprising the steps of:
matching the original document to the email note; and
populating a field of the reply email note with data from the email note.

21. (Original) The method of Claim 20, wherein the step of matching the email note to the original document comprises comparing a first StoreID of the email note to a second StoreID contained in the duplicate document.

22. (Original) The method of Claim 20, wherein the step of matching the email note to the original document comprises comparing a first EntryID of the email note to a second EntryID contained in the duplicate document.